



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

A History of English Rhythms. By EDWIN GUEST, LL. D., D. C. L., F. R. S.
A new edition, edited by the REV. WALTER W. SKEAT, M. A. London,
George Bell & Sons, 1882.

The late Dr. Guest's History of English Rhythms was first published in 1838, and was a pioneer in a new field. It is not much to the credit of English scholars that but little was done for the further elucidation of this subject until the publication of Professor Schipper's work on Old English Metre, early in 1882. Professor Skeat seems to have prepared this new edition of Dr. Guest's work before the publication of Prof. Schipper's, as he nowhere makes allusion to it, although the respective prefaces are dated Sept., 1881, and July, 1882.¹ Schipper's work has already been noticed in this Journal (Vol. III, No. 11, p. 355), and it now remains to give a brief account of Dr. Guest's work, as the first edition has been long out of print, and a new generation of scholars has grown up, many of them born since its publication. Schipper (p. 2) makes the following criticism of this work: "Dr. Guest macht die älteste Form englischer Poesie, nämlich die alliterierende Langzeile, oder vielmehr die rhythmische Section derselben, wie er sich ausdrückt, zur Basis auch der späteren unter ganz anderen Einflüssen sich entwickelnden englischen Verskunst und zieht aus dieser Voraussetzung dann natürlich ganz falsche Schlüsse. Eine weitere Folge davon ist, dass es so verworren angelegt und durchgeführt ist, dass man sich nur mit grosser Mühe, selbst wenn man von seinem Gedankengange sich leiten lässt, hindurchfinden kann, und so ist denn das Werk, trotz der grossen Fülle von Material, die es bietet, als *gänzlich veraltet und unbrauchbar* zu bezeichnen," and he refers, in confirmation of this criticism, to Prof. Mayor's article in the Transactions of the Philological Society for 1873-74. Prof. Skeat has remedied some of the defects of form chargeable to the first edition, in that he has incorporated in the text the notes of that edition, has added notes of his own explaining or correcting statements in the text, has revised the quotations and supplied exact references, and has added an index of authors and a table of rhythms, so that the work is not so unserviceable as formerly. The quotations, however, so far from being "well arranged," as Mr. Skeat says, should have been arranged *historically*, so that we should not find a quotation from Chaucer immediately following one from Burns. Moreover, I do not think that most persons will agree with Mr. Skeat in his preference for the author's method of marking accentuation, namely, with a bar [|] after the accented syllable, so liable to be confounded with metrical division (as Mr. Swifte did confound it),—but this is a small matter.

¹ Prof. Skeat mentions Schipper's work in his introduction to Specimens of Early English, Part I, p. xxxvi, which was published before July, 1882, hence the lack of reference to it in his preface to Dr. Guest's work is the more noticeable.

Instead of simply referring to Ellis and Sweet, Mr. Skeat might have corrected some of Dr. Guest's statements with respect to the values of the English letters; for, however excusable these statements might have been in 1838, they were not so excusable in 1882. It may suffice to refer to the remarks about *y*, and especially to the remark (p. 8 *ad init.*): "but if the *y* of *your* be a consonant, so must also be the *e* of *Europe*," and to the so-called diphthongs "formed by prefixing *y* to the eleven vowels" (p. 11); one might as well speak of the Latin vowel *j* in *jam* or the German vowel *j* in *ja*: Mr. Skeat's note is not helpful on this point. See also the remarks on *w* and *wh* (pp. 9, 10); and as to Mr. Skeat's correction of Dr. Guest's pronunciation of *a* in *Mary* as *a* in *ate*, I would say that this is the almost universal pronunciation in this country, and not as *ai* in *hair*, with Mr. Skeat; again, with respect to the diphthongal character claimed for this sound of *a*, is not that caused by the following *r* in *hair* or *hare*, and when not followed by *r*, is it not a simple vowel as in *glad* (A. S. *glæd*)? See here Sweet's A. S. Reader (p. xvii), where *there* and *hair* are given as key-words for the *long* sound of this vowel [æ] and *man* for the *short* sound. One other letter unnoticed by Mr. Skeat may be mentioned: on p. 65 Dr. Guest speaks of "the *dental* letters *f* and *th*,"—no misprint, as the examples show.

The work is divided into four books, of from seven to ten chapters each. Book I treats of rhythm, the voice, *i. e.* letters and sounds, syllables, accent, quantity, rime, and pauses, so that it is introductory to the whole subject. One great merit of the work consists in the numerous examples given in illustration of each statement, but in the case of our older writers, as Chaucer, for example, better editions have been published of late years, so that the text often needs correction. So too, thanks to Prof. Child, we now know much more about Chaucer's grammar than Dr. Guest knew fifty years ago, and therefore much of what he says about the final *e* is antiquated, but he deserves credit for having rightly appreciated its importance to a correct understanding of Chaucer's verse. On this subject (p. 30) Prof. Skeat refers to "note in the appendix," but unfortunately there is no note there. (It would have been a convenience if a reference had always been given on the page where each note applies.) In his note to p. 31 Mr. Skeat has settled the question as to "Saint Eloy," if it required a re-settlement, notwithstanding Mr. Furnivall's theory. We might allow even the "dainty" prioress so mild an oath. Dr. Guest is careful to notice all cases of elision of vowels in connection with each letter, but Mr. Skeat says: "the very strict views upon the subject of elision which were laid down in the first volume seem to have been considerably relaxed in other passages of the work" (p. vii). The subject of *accent* is too wide to enter upon in a brief review; suffice it to say that Dr. Guest believed it to be "the *sole* principle" that regulates our English rhythms (p. 108), and that we have no metrical quantity in the English language. He thus at once cast aside notions derived from the classical rhythms, and established "the *sole* principle" of English metre, differing from many previous writers on versification, but deserving the thanks of all English scholars. The observed prevalence of this principle doubtless led him to his later more elastic views with respect to elision, for holding strict views on this point is but an illustration of the attempt to reduce English versification to classical rules, and to restrict the freedom of move-

ment of our earlier rhythms. The classical tradition, however, is seen in his refusal to allow more than *one* unaccented syllable, or at most *two* such syllables, between each accented syllable, which causes a total misconception of Anglo-Saxon rhythm, as is seen in the next book.

Book II treats in full Dr. Guest's elaborate system of English rhythms, and after a careful perusal of it, the justness of Schipper's criticism is seen to be fully substantiated. Prof. Skeat's table is here of great assistance in following Dr. Guest's arrangement of his quotations. It would extend this notice to unreasonable length to go into a minute examination of the different classes of rhythms. There are thirty-six varieties, according to the number and position of the accented and unaccented syllables, but section I (A b A), for example, "is intended to include similar metres of *more* than three syllables, such as A b A b A," and so on *ad infinitum*, and the change of the pause, or caesura, is considered to change the character of the rhythm, so that the examples given by Mr. Skeat from L'Allegro (p. xviii), by way of illustration, are arranged as follows:

"Haste | thee nymph | : and bring | with thee | " (the bar denoting the accent), is A b A : b A b A, or 1 : 5, while "And | the milk | maid : sing | eth blithe | " is A b A b : A b A, or 1 : 1, / denoting the unaccented syllable added to 1 (A b A). The colon [:] denotes the caesural pause between the sections, which Schipper (pp. 258-9) excludes from rhythm of this kind originally, though he concedes that it entered later. He thinks that Dr. Guest's assumption of it in the earlier rhythms of four feet, as in the Owl and Nightingale, has caused him to mingle verses of different origin, which view seems justified by the examples. But the possibilities of the system may be shown in Dr. Guest's own words. He says (p. 160): "Our verses of two and three accents consist merely of the simple sections; but the verse of four accents is the representative of the short alliterative couplet, containing two sections, each of two accents. The number then of all the possible varieties is the product of eighteen multiplied into itself, or 324. In like manner the verse of six accents is composed of two sections, each containing three; and the number of possible varieties is the product of thirty-six multiplied by itself, or 1296. The possible varieties of the verse with five accents is also 1296: to wit, 648 when the first section has two accents, and the like number when it has three." He well adds: "Of this vast number, by far the larger portion has never yet been applied to the purposes of verse." (!) When one has once conceived a mechanically regular system of such prodigious scope, it would be strange indeed if, in the most regular poems, lines showing metrical license could not here and there be found which might be brought under one or other of the above-mentioned forms, so that in chapter III, on verses of four accents, lines from L'Allegro and Il Penseroso are quoted under no less than *eight* different sectional groups, and the line "The cherub Con : temptation" (p. 185) is treated as false rhythm, because the caesura is disregarded, or misplaced. The metre of these two poems, however, is not derived from the Anglo-Saxon alliterative line, as Dr. Guest would have us believe; but it is the riming couplet of four feet (treated by Schipper in section III, chapter 14), the verses beginning with either an accented or an unaccented syllable. In this chapter alone Dr. Guest rightly treats Anglo-Saxon rhythms, as he finds many examples of verses showing the four accents, separated by one or two unac-

cented syllables, but in the following chapters on verses of five accents, arranged according as the section of two accents precedes or follows that of three accents, his treatment of Anglo-Saxon verse is erroneous. In chapter I (p. 159) of this book he takes exception to Rask's view of the "complement," and lays down his own rules, but Rask's view was more nearly right. Prof. Skeat does not anywhere lead us to suppose that he differs from Dr. Guest, though it is scarcely possible that he should hold these antiquated views with respect to Anglo-Saxon verse. The following examples will show Dr. Guest's accentuation:

sec | ga swat | e : sith | than sun | ne up | (p. 210);
 gif | um grow | ende | : on god | es ric | e (p. 232);
 ne | waes her | tha giet | : nym | the heol | ster-scead | o (p. 249);
 wes | an an | e win | ter-stun | de : thon | ne ic mid | this wer | ode (p. 268)¹

On this system the regular Anglo-Saxon alliterative verse may have four, five, six, and even seven accents, and the long lines of the pseudo-Caedmon eight and nine accents (pp. 275-6). The examples of Anglo-Saxon verse are taken chiefly from Genesis and Exodus, and from the so-called Metres of Aelfred,² whose very defective rhythm will not serve as a basis for any sound conclusions. Many examples from Chaucer and Shakspeare have been corrected by Professor Skeat, and so have vitiated the conclusions of Dr. Guest drawn from them; but the accentuation of others might have been corrected; e. g.,

Vive | le roi | : as | I have bank'd | their towns | K. J. 5. 7, 104 (p. 209);
 read "Vi | ve" and "as I |,"
 Of | the bod | ies : and | the gret | e honour | , Knights Tale, C. T. 993
 (p. 211);
 read Of the | bodi | es : and | the grete | honour | ;
 In | his fight | inge : wer | e a wood | leon | , 1665;
 read In his | fighting | ë : were | a wood | leon | ;

I use the bar to mark the accent, not the metrical division into feet, for the sake of comparison, though the two coincide in the examples from Chaucer.

Prof. Skeat has been too sparing in his corrections of false accents, although the corrections made are almost invariably right. Dr. Guest's views have led him wrong also in respect to the metre of Layamon, and Prof. Skeat has followed him; but this metre is developed from the Anglo-Saxon alliterative line, as Schipper has shown (section III, chapter 7), though under Norman-French influence, and it is therefore much freer in its movement.³ So in respect to the metre of Piers Plowman, which poem Prof. Skeat has made his own, it also is derived from the Anglo-Saxon alliterative line, and has been discussed by Schipper (section III, chapter 10). I have no space for examples of this mistaken accentuation, but some may be found on p. 254 *ad fin.* Prof. Skeat has rightly corrected Dr. Guest's note on *eyr* (p. 176), and for examples of

¹ The quantity of the Anglo-Saxon vowels is not marked in the work.

² A. Leicht, in *Anglia* VI 126, discusses the question of the authorship of the alliterating metres of Boethius, and comes to the conclusion that the metres were not written by King Alfred, thus agreeing with Wright, as against Hartmann, who, in *Anglia* V 411, had come to a different conclusion.

³ Compare on the metre of Layamon the articles of Wissmann, Einkenel, Schipper, and Trautmann in *Anglia* V.

both *eir* and *heir* antecedent to Chaucer, I would add Havelok, 606, and King Horn, 907. The last chapter of this book, on the Sectional Pause, has some useful remarks. Dr. Guest rightly regards it as "filling the place of an unaccented syllable," and so often corresponds to the failure of thesis, but he assumes a sectional pause also where there is simply a reverse rhythm, the accents then immediately following each other, which, in the examples quoted of English heroic metre, occurs most frequently in the second foot, but sometimes in the fourth. The same misconception in respect to Anglo-Saxon verse prevails here too, and some accentuations even of Shakspeare's lines may be objected to.

Book III is the longest and most interesting portion of the volume. It treats historically the Anglo-Saxon rhythms, the Early English sectional metres derived from them, with a history of the alliterative line and its modification by the accentual rhythm of the Latin chaunts, and the Psalm metres, which are regarded as "the natural growth of the Latin rhythm modified by the native rhythm of the language" (p. 302). The metres of five accents, the unfortunately named "tumbling" metres, loose rhythms, and certain metrical experiments are more briefly considered. Extracts with translation are given from the pseudo-Caedmon, the so-called Alfred's Metres, the Brunanburh War Song, the Confessor's Death Song, the Traveller's Song, and the Grave, which last, however, is too late to be regarded as a specimen of Anglo-Saxon versification. Dr. Guest well says (p. 315): "the scansion of an Anglo-Saxon verse is not a matter of mere curiosity. There can be little doubt that the modern accentuation of our language is mainly built upon that of its earliest dialect; and that we must investigate the latter before we can arrive at any satisfactory arrangement of the former." These wise words render, therefore, all the more necessary a correct arrangement of the latter, *i. e.* the Anglo-Saxon rhythms, and, after the study which German scholars have bestowed on this subject, we cannot consider Dr. Guest's system as any longer tenable, but we must ever remember that Dr. Guest was a pioneer. Dr. Guest, too, did not have the advantage of our modern editions of Anglo-Saxon and Early English works, but was obliged to labor over MSS, often inaccurate, and sometimes almost unintelligible, so that his remark with regard to Hickes, Lye, and Conybeare (p. 303), may be applied to himself: "They who devote themselves to discovery have rarely time for minute investigation; and their mistakes may well claim the forbearance of those who have profited by their labors." He insists upon the importance of following the MSS, and in noticing the "New Saxonist" controversy, criticizes Thorpe's Caedmon, though exempting Kemble's Beowulf, in part, from his criticisms, but it is strange that he did not make use of that work in preference to the defective "Metres" for his study of Anglo-Saxon rhythms.

Chapter III, on Sectional Metre, begins with a discussion of the Riming Poem, which seems scarcely to deserve the attention given to it. It is no fair specimen of Anglo-Saxon poetry, but remains alone in that literature, apparently as an effort of some old monk to show his skill in heaping together rimes with little regard to the intelligibility of the ideas conveyed. In connection with the metre of Layamon, Dr. Guest gives us some acute and valuable, but all too brief, remarks on his dialect and on the history of the language, and we must remember that this was ten years before Sir Frederic Madden's *editio princeps*.

An extract from *King Horn* follows, but Schipper (section III, chapter 9) is much fuller, and often differs from Dr. Guest in his accentuation, especially in those lines where failure of thesis is assumed. The *Owl and Nightingale*, *Assumption of the Virgin*, and *Havelok*, serve as examples of the metre of four accents, the origin of which, Dr. Guest thinks, is "involved in much obscurity" (p. 424); the first of these poems is the oldest he knows in that metre (p. 427),¹ but Schipper, who discusses the *Owl and Nightingale* (in section III, chapter 14), has explained this metre as occurring in the *Pater Noster* of the preceding century, *i. e.* the twelfth, and as of Norman-French origin, being seen in Wace's *Brut*, and other French poems, and derived from the iambic tetrameter *acatalectic*.

William and the Werwolf, or William of Palerne, as Mr. Skeat calls it, the *Siege of Jerusalem*, "still unprinted," says Mr. Skeat, *Piers Plowman* (though no extracts of this poem are given), and *Gawayn and the Green Knight*, ascribed with probability, Dr. Guest thinks (p. 459), to Hugh of Eglynton, or "Huchown," mentioned in Wynton's *Chronicle*,—serve as examples of the Old English alliterative metre, and the chapter closes with some brief remarks on the origin of British Romance, the *King Arthur cycle*, in connection with the question of the authorship of *Sir Tristrem*.

Chapter VI treats the Psalm Metres, and first the *Ormulum*, whose rhythm is derived from the catalectic iambic tetrameter of the Latin mediaeval hymns, as Schipper also takes it (section III, chapter 3), but without rime. Dr. Guest regards the *Ormulum* "as the oldest, the purest, and by far the most valuable specimen of our Old English dialect that time has left us" (p. 477), and in discussing its dialect, he treats us to some most acute, interesting and valuable remarks on the English dialects, which show, as Mr. Skeat well says (p. xi), "how much he was in advance of many of his contemporaries," and his conclusions have been but confirmed by the further more thorough studies of Dr. Morris and others. Dr. Guest refers to an article in the *Quarterly Review*, No. 110, on our "English Dialects," of which Mr. Skeat says: "I suppose it was written by R. Garnett" (p. 478, note 1), but if he had simply looked into the *Rev. Mr. Garnett's Philological Essays* (p. 41), he might have been certain about it. This is a valuable article on the subject discussed, and deserves consideration as the first of its kind, and while Dr. Guest does not acknowledge the five dialects proposed by Mr. Garnett, his conclusions are not so "different" that Mr. Garnett's proposed classification cannot be readily accommodated to them.

Dr. Guest calls *Ormin's* rhythm the "common metre" of our hymn books, but he overlooks the short syllable over, which is invariably present in the *Ormulum* and lacking in common metre. *Orm's* metre wants one syllable, while common metre wants two syllables, to equal the iambic tetrameter. Dr. Guest discusses also the *Alexandrine*, and instances Robert of Brunne's translation of *Langtoft's Chronicle* as the earliest example of it, imitated directly from the French. He thinks the classical metre which gave rise to it "by no means an obvious one" (p. 515), but I would refer for a fuller treatment of the

¹ On p. 684, however, Dr. Guest says of the *Pater Noster*: "This poem is written in the same kind of verse as the *Hule and Niȝtengale*, and is, if genuine, the earliest specimen of such metre in our language." After Strutt, he ascribes it to Pope Adrian.

subject to Schipper, section III, chapters 5 and 13, and for its origin to chapter 1 also. The expression "tumbling verse" is derived from King James's "Reulis and Cautelis," and is most unfortunate to designate the anapaestic rhythms, or mixed iambic and anapaestic, of which a very indifferent example is given from Lydgate's "London Lickpenny," and another from Spenser's Shepherd's Calendar, February, of which Dr. Guest says (p. 536): "The distinction between this metre and that of Christabel is slight indeed," but Coleridge claims that his metre is "founded on a *new principle*, namely, that of counting in each line the accents, not the syllables."¹ The principle is certainly old enough, being the basis of all Anglo-Saxon rhythms, but having been so long neglected, Coleridge might claim credit for its revival.

Other matters worthy of consideration must be passed over, in order to notice briefly book IV, which treats of poems written in staves, or stanzas, although the two are thus defined by Dr. Guest (p. 562): "A stave is a portion of a song or poem, containing a given number of verses, arranged according to some given law, and ending with a period, or at least with some important division of a sentence. When two or more staves are knit together into one, the compound stave thence resulting may be called a stanza—a name that seems to have been first applied to the compound Italian staves, which came into fashion during the sixteenth century." The ordinary *common*, *long* or *short* metre stanza, then, is simply a stave, while the sonnet is a stanza proper. Popular usage, however, does not recognize the distinction. The stave forms are treated by Schipper in section IV, chapters 1-7 on *strophes*. Dr. Guest thinks (p. 564) that during the eleventh and early twelfth century our versification was gradually taking a form similar to the Icelandic, and if it "had continued free from foreign influences but one century longer, it might have exhibited the same peculiarities of structure which were afterwards adopted by the Icelandic." We should be thankful, then, to the "foreign influences" on this account, as on many others. This book treats the origin of the staves from Latin and Romance rhythms, and their various forms, those with continuous and interwoven rime, the psalm staves, those with the burthen, wheel, and bob-wheel, or "short and abrupt wheel, which came into fashion during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries" (p. 621), and (whether of Latin or Celtic origin, Dr. Guest does not stop to inquire) was "familiar to the Romance dialects before it was adopted by the English," the earliest native specimen being found in a Hymn to the Virgin of about the year 1200. The "ballet-stave" in its various forms is next discussed,—the most common being the Chaucer stanza of seven lines, or "rhythme-royal," as Gascoigne called it,—the *roundle* and the *virelay*, though Dr. Guest does not "profess to give every variety of ballet-stave that may be found in our poetry, for the number would rather confuse the reader than enlighten him" (p. 650); and finally, the sonnet, which is, however, all too briefly treated. While of Sicilian origin, it owes its celebrity to Petrarch, but its structure was changed by the Italians of the sixteenth century; it was introduced into English verse by Surrey [and Wyatt], and used by Spenser, Shakspeare and Milton, by whose aid it recovered its original form. The final couplet was soon lost, and the

¹ For some judicious remarks on the metre of Christabel compare Leigh Hunt's essay on "What is Poetry?" prefixed to his Selections from the English Poets.

sonnet gave birth to the elegiac stave, which, with the ballad stave, thinks Dr. Guest, was the last invented (p. 656).

The following chapter treats the "broken staves," of which Waller's familiar song, "Go, lovely rose," is an example of a stave of five verses broken in the first and third, and Bryant's [not Briant's] "Address to a Waterfowl," is an example of another variety. It may be remarked, in passing, that this is the sole quotation I find from any American poet. The Spenser staves are next discussed, under which title are included not only the Spenserian stanza of nine verses, but all those in which an Alexandrine is added to some well-known combination, or substituted for the last verse of the stanza (p. 667). Dr. Guest remarks with reference to the Spenser stave used by Chatterton that "this anachronism would, of itself, be sufficient to prove the forgery, even though it had baffled every other test which modern criticism has applied to it" (p. 672), and Mr. Skeat adds a quotation to the same effect from his *Essay on the Rowley Poems*. The last chapter contains a brief historical sketch of our early poets and their works, from the fifth century to the fourteenth inclusive, but whatever the date of the Gleeman's Song, which must be interpolated, modern criticism will hardly assign "Beowulf" to the fifth century, although "they are the most venerable relics of our early literature" (p. 675).

Whatever exceptions may be taken to Dr. Guest's statements, or to his classification of English rhythms, it is well to have his valuable work accessible in convenient form, although much of it is now antiquated, and it should have been accompanied by a commentary stating the more modern views on various points. This publication makes all the more necessary a speedy translation into English of Schipper's work, for it is to be hoped that English scholars will not take Dr. Guest's work as an unquestioned authority, when one written from the standpoint of modern criticism, in a strictly historical and much more systematic manner, is readily accessible. The subject is one of great interest, and one which has been sadly neglected, so that it has been thought advisable to republish this work, which dates back a half-century, and was the sole authority for its day. A handbook for instruction in the history and classification of English rhythms is much needed, but it will be written on the basis of Prof. Schipper's work rather than of Dr. Guest's. The two invite comparison and there can be no question as to the preference. It is only to be hoped that Schipper's work may be soon completed, so that the subject may be brought down to the present day.

Prof. Skeat adds to the volume a list of Dr. Guest's papers on philological subjects, which are buried in the *Proceedings of the Philological Society of London*. Now that the collection of his archaeological papers has been published in "*Origines Celticae*,"—an insufficient title,—it would be a useful work to have his philological papers also republished, for they treat subjects important to every English scholar, and idioms on which I do not doubt that one of his clear perception and extensive learning has thrown much light. Dr. Guest highly appreciated the study of his own language, and his remarks on the neglect of it, while not so applicable now as in 1838, are still too true: "The little attention that is paid to the critical study of our language, and the slight regard which attempts to investigate its history have met with, reflect no less discredit on our patriotism than on our scholarship" (pp. 702-3). The Early

English Text Society has done much to relieve English scholars of this discredit, but the results of its labors still need to be systematized and put in more popular and accessible form. After commenting on the range of influence of the English language even in 1838—and how much greater now!—Dr. Guest well concludes: "Though it were not our mother-tongue, it would still, of all living languages [or dead, I would add], be the one most worthy of our study and our cultivation, as bearing most directly on the happiness of mankind."

JAMES M. GARNETT.

Sammlung Romanischer Grammatiken. Raetoromanische Grammatik, von TH. GARTNER. 80 pp., xlviii, 206. Heilbronn, Henninger, 1883.

Just as in the rapidly developing science of biology, the student of medicine changes the basis of his investigation with reference to the old school and studies animal life from the standpoint of living forms, so the student of modern languages turns from the fixed forms of written speech to the living dialects to study the historical growth of language in its formative period.

The paramount importance of dialectology for the proper discrimination and classification of any set of language elements is now generally recognized, and constitutes the most striking difference between the leading drift of language-study to-day and ten to fifteen years ago. Before this, the dialects were regarded as rich sources of phonetic law and morphological change, but they were not insisted upon as absolutely necessary to a correct knowledge of the diversified linguistic products which have been gradually moulded and built up into our present systems of complex speech. And nowhere else more than in the Romance languages has late dialect research proved a valuable aid in the solution of grammatical questions, beyond the reach of general principles, which, to a certain extent, are applicable to all the individual members of the group. Hitherto, scientific Romance grammar has dealt only with those literary idioms which constitute to-day the common vehicles of thought for the majority of the Neo-latin peoples. At the present time we demand of it that it represent, in a greater or less degree of fullness, the peculiarities, written and unwritten, of those divers centres of dialect influence which helped to make up the current language. It was, therefore, with a wise perception of our contemporary needs that, as far back as 1878, a movement was set on foot in Germany to publish a series of Romance grammars that should fully embody the spirit and method of research characteristic of the existing state of these studies. The collaborators in the enterprise have worked steadily for five years in the various departments of the field to which they were assigned, and the first to offer us the results of his labors is Prof. Gartner, of Vienna, in his *Raetoromanische Grammatik*, a veritable wonder of untiring patience and industry, and a fine model of scientific dialect investigation. To collect the materials for his work, the author received, first, a year's leave of absence from his academic duties, during which time he travelled over the whole language-territory, noting carefully the differences of idiom on the spot; and then a second term of the same length was granted him to work up his linguistic stock. How well he has done the latter, out of an enormous wealth of forms, no one will be able to appreciate better than the Romance scholar who has